arXiv:1404.3065v2 [math.NA] 10 Apr 2015

INSTANCE OPTIMAL CROUZEIX-RAVIART ADAPTIVE FINITE ELEMENT METHODS FOR THE POISSON AND STOKES PROBLEMS

CHRISTIAN KREUZER AND MIRA SCHEDENSACK

Abstract. We extend the ideas of Diening, Kreuzer, and Stevenson [Instance optimality of the adaptive maximum strategy, Found. Comput. Math. (2015)], from conforming approximations of the Poisson problem to nonconforming Crouzeix-Raviart approximations of the Poisson and the Stokes problem in 2D. As a consequence, we obtain instance optimality of an AFEM with a modified maximum marking strategy.

1. Introduction

In recent years there has been an immense progress in the convergence and optimality analysis of adaptive finite element methods (AFEMs) for the numerical solution of partial differential equations. Such methods typically consist of a loop

$$\mathsf{SOLVE} \to \mathsf{ESTIMATE} \to \mathsf{MARK} \to \mathsf{REFINE}. \tag{1.1}$$

In ESTIMATE local indicators are computed. These indicators are used in MARK in order to mark elements for refinement based on some marking strategy.

In 1996, Dörfler [Dör96] introduced a bulk chasing marking strategy, which guarantees linear convergence for sufficiently fine initial triangulations. The latter condition was removed by Morin, Nochetto & Siebert in [MNS00, MNS02]. Binev, Dahmen, and DeVore [BDD04] supplemented this AFEM by a so-called *coarsening* routine and showed instance optimality of the resulting method; compare also with [Bin07]. This means that, for a triangulation generated by the AFEM the corresponding error is, up to some multiplicative constant, smaller than the error corresponding to any (admissible) triangulation with, up to some second fixed multiplicative constant, at most the same number of newly generated triangles. We emphasize that this property is satisfied for every triangulation generated by the AFEM and is in particular non-asymptotic.

Relying on the same strategy, Stevenson [Ste07] and later Cascon, Kreuzer, Nochetto & Siebert [CKNS08] proved optimal convergence rates of an AFEM,

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 65N30, 65N12, 65N50, 65N15, 41A25.

Key words and phrases. Adaptive finite element methods, optimal cardinality, convergence, maximum marking strategy, nonconforming finite element methods.

without coarsening when the bulk parameter is below some problem dependent threshold. The latter result refers to convergence rates for the so called total error, which is the sum of the error and the oscillation. Together with the linear convergence this even entails optimal computational complexity of the method; compare with [Ste07]. These features promoted the popularity of Dörfler's marking strategy in the numerical analysis of conforming and nonconforming AFEMs for elliptic problems; compare e.g. with [MNS03, BDK12, KS11, CHX, MN05, FFP, BN10, BMS10, Rab10, CH06] as well as with the overview articles [NSV09, CFPP14] and the references therein. However, it can be observed in numerical experiments that Dörfler's marking strategy may indeed fail to be optimal for large marking parameters; compare e.g. with [BFH14, §8]. Furthermore, the sharp value of the threshold is in general unknown respectively the theoretical bounds are very conservative. This makes the choice of the 'right' marking parameter delicate.

In contrast to this, only very little is known about the *maximum marking strategy*, which marks all elements whose indicators are bigger than the marking parameter times the maximal indicator; compare e.g. with [MSV08, Sie11]. This strategy is widely-used in engineering and scientific computation and numerical computations indicate that its performance is robust with respect to the choice of the marking parameter. This observation was recently verified theoretically by Diening, Kreuzer & Stevenson in [DKS15] who proved instance optimality of a conforming AFEM with modified maximum marking strategy for the Poisson problem in two dimensions. In particular, the maximum strategy is applied to some modified indicators, which accumulate effects according to conforming mesh refinements and the instance optimality refers to the total error. We recall that, apart from the oscillatory term in the total error, instance optimality is a non-asymptotic property and thus implies convergence with optimal rates. The result relies on new ideas exploiting sharp discrete efficiency and discrete reliability bounds, a newly developed tree structure of newest vertex bisection as well as a newly developed so-called lower diamond estimate for the Dirichlet energy.

The aim of this paper is to extend the ideas of [DKS15] to Crouzeix-Raviart AFEMs for the Poisson and the Stokes equations. For the Stokes problem, standard conforming finite elements are based on the saddle point formulation and satisfy the incompressibility condition in a weak sense only; see [BF91]. In contrast to this, Crouzeix-Raviart finite elements allow for piecewise exactly divergence free velocity approximations. The discretisation therefore becomes a minimising problem on the subspace of nonconforming divergence free finite element functions. This fact was used in the proofs of optimal convergence rates of nonconforming AFEMs with Dörfler's marking strategy in [BM11, CPR13, HX13]. In our case, the above observation allows to define generalised energies for the Stokes problem similarly as for the Poisson problem. For both problems, the generalised energy is

monotone under refinement, satisfies the lower diamond estimate, and the energy difference is equivalent to the sum of the nonconforming total error, i.e., the sum of the nonconforming error and the oscillation. Based on an improvement of the so called transfer operator from [CGS13], we conclude the precise discrete efficiency and discrete reliability bounds. According to [DKS15], we conclude that an AFEM with modified marking strategy is instance optimal for the nonconforming total error.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we present the abstract setting used in [DKS15] including the error bounds, the lower diamond estimate, and the AFEM. In Section 3 we shall verify this setting for the Poisson problem and in Section 4 we extend the ideas to the Stokes equations. The appendix presents the required modifications of the transfer operator from [CGS13].

2. Abstract Setting

In this section we shall introduce the basic framework, which is used in [DKS15] in order to prove instance optimality of a conforming adaptive finite element method for Poisson's problem.

2.1. **Refinement Framework.** We consider mesh adaptation by newest vertex bisection (NVB) in two dimensions; compare with [Bän91, Kos94, Mau95, Tra97, BDD04, Ste08] as well as [NSV09, SS05] and the references therein. We denote by $\mathcal{T}_\perp$ a conforming initial or "bottom" triangulation of a polygonal domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ such that the labelling of the newest vertices satisfies the *matching assumption*:

$$\text{(2.1)} \qquad \begin{aligned} &\textit{If, for } T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_\perp,\ T \cap T' \textit{ is the refinement edge of } T,\\ &\textit{then it is the refinement edge of } T'. \end{aligned}$$

It is shown in [BDD04], that such a labelling can be found for any conforming $\mathcal{T}_\perp$. We denote by $\mathbb{T}$ the set of all conforming refinements of $\mathcal{T}_\perp$ that can be created by finitely many newest vertex bisections. Then $\mathbb{T}$ is uniformly shape regular, i.e., there exists a constant $C = C(\mathcal{T}_\perp)$, such that

$$\sup_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} \max_{T\in\mathcal{T}} \frac{\operatorname{diam}(T)}{|T|^{1/2}} \le C < \infty.$$

For $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, let $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$ be the set of its sides and $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{T})$ the set of its nodes. We denote by $h_\mathcal{T} : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, $h_\mathcal{T}|_T := h_T := |T|^{1/2}$, $T \in \mathcal{T}$, the piecewise constant mesh-size function and by $h_S := |S|$ the length of the side $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$.

For $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_\star \in \mathbb{T}$, we write $\mathcal{T} \le \mathcal{T}_\star$ or $\mathcal{T}_\star \ge \mathcal{T}$, when $\mathcal{T}_\star$ is a *refinement* of $\mathcal{T}$ or, equivalently, when $\mathcal{T}$ is a *coarsening* of $\mathcal{T}_\star$. This defines a partial ordering on $\mathbb{T}$. We denote by $\mathcal{T} \wedge \mathcal{T}_\star \in \mathbb{T}$ the finest common coarsening and by $\mathcal{T} \vee \mathcal{T}_\star \in \mathbb{T}$ the coarsest common refinement of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}_\star$. Then $(\mathbb{T}, \le)$ is a lattice with bottom $\mathcal{T}_\perp$. Moreover, we can formally define a largest refinement $\mathcal{T}^\top := \bigvee_{\mathcal{T}\in\mathbb{T}} \mathcal{T}$, and set $\mathcal{T}^\top \ge \mathcal{T}$ for all $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$. Then

$\widehat{\mathbb{T}} := \mathbb{T} \cup \{\mathcal{T}^\top\}$ is a bounded lattice; compare with [DKS15]. For the sake of a uniform presentation, we set $\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^\top := \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}) \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}^\top) := \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$.

Let $\omega_S^{\mathcal{T}} := \text{interior} \bigcup \{T \in \mathcal{T} \mid S \subset \partial T\}$ denote the patch of $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$. For $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, we define as $\Omega(\mathcal{U}) := \text{interior}(\bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{U}} T)$ the domain of $\mathcal{U}$. Thanks to basic properties of bisection, for $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_\star \in \mathbb{T}$, $\mathcal{T}_\star \geq \mathcal{T}$, we have the mesh-size reduction property

$$h^2_{\mathcal{T}_\star}|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)} \leq \frac{1}{2}\, h^2_{\mathcal{T}}|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)}. \tag{2.2}$$

The following definition introduces diamonds of triangulations.

Definition 2.1. *For $\{\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_m\} \subset \mathbb{T}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we call $(\mathcal{T}^\wedge, \mathcal{T}_\vee; \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_m)$ a* lower diamond *in $\mathbb{T}$ of size m, when $\mathcal{T}^\wedge = \bigwedge_{j=1}^m \mathcal{T}_j$, $\mathcal{T}_\vee = \bigvee_{j=1}^m \mathcal{T}_j$, and the areas of* coarsening $\Omega(\mathcal{T}_j \setminus \mathcal{T}_\vee)$ *are pairwise disjoint.*

We suppose that a function REFINE is at our disposal such that for $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ and $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$ we have that $\mathcal{T}_\star = \mathsf{REFINE}(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{M})$ is the *coarsest refinement of $\mathcal{T}$ in $\mathbb{T}$ with $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star) = \emptyset$*. To be more precise, we have

$$\mathsf{REFINE}(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{M}) = \bigwedge \{\mathcal{T}' \in \mathbb{T} : \mathcal{T}' \geq \mathcal{T},\, \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}') = \emptyset\}.$$

Note that this routine can be implemented using iterative or recursive bisection; see [Bän91, Kos94, Mau95, Mit89, Tra97, Ste08].

Let $\{\mathcal{T}_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \subset \mathbb{T}$, with $\mathcal{T}_0 = \mathcal{T}_\perp$ and $\mathcal{M}_k \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_k)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, such that $\mathcal{T}_{k+1} = \mathsf{REFINE}(\mathcal{T}_k; \mathcal{M}_k)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then

$$\#(\mathcal{T}_k \setminus \mathcal{T}_\perp) \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \#\mathcal{M}_j, \tag{2.3}$$

with a constant $C > 0$ depending solely on $\mathcal{T}_\perp$; compare with [BDD04, DKS15].

Remark 2.2. *We note that, in order to obtain* (2.3)*, for an iterative realization of the NVB the matching assumption* (2.1) *is not necessary in 2D; see* [KPP13]*. However, assumption* (2.1) *is needed to properly define a so called* population *tree structure on triangulations, which is a newly developed crucial tool in the instance optimality analysis of* [DKS15].

2.2. **Problem Setting.** In this section we present the problem properties, which have been used in the instance optimality analysis of [DKS15].

Energy. We assume that there exists an energy $\mathcal{G} : \widehat{\mathbb{T}} \to \mathbb{R}$, which is monotonically decreasing with respect to the partial ordering of $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}$, i.e., we have

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}_\star) \leq \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) \qquad \text{for all } \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_\star \in \widehat{\mathbb{T}}, \mathcal{T} \leq \mathcal{T}_\star. \tag{2.4}$$

The overall aim is then to efficiently construct a triangulation $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, such that

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) - \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}^\top) \qquad \text{is } \textit{small}. \tag{2.5}$$

Error Bounds. For $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, the energy difference is equivalent to the squared sum of some computable local a posteriori indicators $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}^2(S) \geq 0$, $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}$:

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) - \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}^\top) \eqsim \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}^2(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})) := \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})} \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}^2(S). \tag{2.6a}$$

Moreover, if $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_\star \in \mathbb{T}$, $\mathcal{T}_\star \geq \mathcal{T}$, then we have the *localised* equivalence relation

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) - \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}_\star) \eqsim \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}^2(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}) \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)). \tag{2.6b}$$

Here and in the following, the formula $A \lesssim B$ or $B \gtrsim A$ abbreviates that there exists some positive generic constant $C > 0$, depending only on properties of $\mathcal{G}$ and parameters of $\mathcal{T}_\perp$, such that $A \leq CB$; $A \eqsim B$ abbreviates $A \lesssim B \lesssim A$.

Lower Diamond Estimates. We further assume, that the energy $\mathcal{G} : \widehat{\mathbb{T}} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the *lower diamond estimate*, i.e., we have for any lower diamond $(\mathcal{T}^\wedge, \mathcal{T}_\vee; \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_m)$ in $\mathbb{T}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, that

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}^\wedge) - \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}_\vee) \eqsim \sum_{j=1}^m \big(\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}_j) - \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}_\vee)\big). \tag{2.7}$$

Remark 2.3 (Energy)**.** *The definition of $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T})$ typically involves the finite element solution on $\mathcal{T}$ and is motivated by some problem specific energy. Consider, e.g., the Poisson problem: The solution $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ of*

$$-\Delta u = f \text{ in } \Omega \qquad \text{and} \qquad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

minimises the Dirichlet energy

$$\mathcal{J}(v) := \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}|\nabla v|^2 - fv \,\mathrm{d}x, \quad v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$$

over $H_0^1(\Omega)$. For the standard P_1 conforming discretization in [DKS15]*, we have that the finite element spaces are nested under refinement, i.e., if $\mathcal{T}_\star \geq \mathcal{T}$, then $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{T}) \geq \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{T}_\star)$. Here we used the abbreviation $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{T}) := \mathcal{J}(u_\mathcal{T})$ with $u_\mathcal{T}$ being the Galerkin approximation corresponding to $\mathcal{T}$. In order to ensure* (2.6) *for the standard residual error estimator, the energy $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T})$ is then defined by $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{T})$ plus some data dependent term (the element residual in the scaled L^2-norm); compare with* [DKS15, §4]*. According to*

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\nabla u - \nabla v|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x = \mathcal{J}(v) - \mathcal{J}(u) \qquad \text{for all } v \in H_0^1(\Omega),$$

we have that energy differences correspond to errors and the error bounds in (2.6a) *are known as efficiency and reliability of the error estimator.*

For the definition of the energy $\mathcal{G}$ in the case of nonconforming Crouzeix-Raviart finite elements see Sections 3.2 and 4.2.

Remark 2.4. *The error indicators are organised by edges for the following reasons:*

- *For element based a posteriori indicators, the localised upper bound for the error of two nested discrete finite element solutions typically requires slightly more elements than the corresponding lower bound. Thus an equivalence property as in* (2.6b) *cannot be strictly satisfied; compare e.g. with the localised upper bound in* [CKNS08], [DKS15], *and Section 3.3 below.*
- *Each midpoint of an edge $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$ can be identified with the* new *nodes $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{T}^{++}) \setminus \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{T})$ of the triangulation $\mathcal{T}^{++}$ where all elements of $\mathcal{T}$ are refined exactly twice (or equivalently all sides of $\mathcal{T}$ are refined exactly once). We recall from Remark 2.2 that the nodes of a triangulation can be identified with the corresponding population, i.e., the side based indicators $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}(S)$, $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$, can be interpreted as population based indicators by identifying S with $\mathsf{mid}(S) \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{T}^{++}) \setminus \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{T})$. This fact is crucial in the instance optimality analysis of* [DKS15].

2.3. **An Instance Optimal AFEM.** In order to formally describe the adaptive method, for $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ and $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$, let

$$\mathsf{ref'd}(\mathcal{T}; S) := \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}) \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathsf{REFINE}(\mathcal{T}; S)),$$

i.e., $\mathsf{ref'd}(\mathcal{T}; S)$ is the subset of sides in $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$ that are bisected in the smallest refinement of $\mathcal{T}$ in which S is bisected.

Algorithm 2.1 (AFEM)**.** *Fix $\mu \in (0, 1]$ and set $\mathcal{T}_0 := \mathcal{T}_\perp$ and $k = 0$. The adaptive loop is an iteration of the following steps:*

(1) SOLVE: solve the discrete problem on $\mathcal{T}_k$;

(2) ESTIMATE: compute $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^2_{\mathcal{T}_k} := \max\{\mathcal{E}^2_{\mathcal{T}_k}(\mathsf{ref'd}(\mathcal{T}_k; S)) : S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_k)\}$;

(3) MARK: set $\mathcal{M}_k := \emptyset$, $\mathcal{C}_k := \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_k)$, and $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k := \emptyset$;

while $\mathcal{C}_k \neq \emptyset$ do

select $S \in \mathcal{C}_k$;

if $\mathcal{E}^2_{\mathcal{T}_k}(\mathsf{ref'd}(\mathcal{T}_k; S) \setminus \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k) \geq \mu \bar{\mathcal{E}}^2_{\mathcal{T}_k}$;

then $\mathcal{M}_k := \mathcal{M}_k \cup \{S\}$;

$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k := \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k \cup \mathsf{ref'd}(\mathcal{T}_k; S)$;

end if;

$\mathcal{C}_k := \mathcal{C}_k \setminus \mathsf{ref'd}(\mathcal{T}_k; S)$;

end while;

(4) REFINE: compute $\mathcal{T}_{k+1} = \mathsf{REFINE}(\mathcal{T}_k; \mathcal{M}_k)$ and increment k.

Remark 2.5. *We emphasise that the definition of the a posteriori indicators $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}(S)$, $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$, usually involve the finite element solution on $\mathcal{T}$. The*

evaluation of the indicators requires therefore the solution of the corresponding discrete system, which is computed in the step SOLVE.

The step MARK *is the so called* modified maximum marking strategy. *Roughly speaking, our modification of the maximum marking strategy replaces the role of the error indicator associated with an edge $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_k)$ by the sum of the error indicators over the edges $\mathsf{ref'd}(\mathcal{T}_k; S)$, which necessarily have to be bisected together with S in order to retain a conforming triangulation. When more then one edge is marked for refinement the effect of previously marked edges has to be subtracted. This is encoded in the set $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_k$.*

Under the assumptions in Section 2.2, it is proved in [DKS15] that this AFEM is instance optimal.

Theorem 2.6. *Assume that* (2.4), (2.6), *and* (2.7) *are satisfied and let $\{\mathcal{T}_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ be the sequence of triangulations in 2D produced by Algorithm 2.1. Then, there exists a constant $C \geq 1$, such that*

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}_k) \leq \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) \qquad \text{for all } \mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T} \text{ with } \quad C\#(\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}_\perp) \leq \#(\mathcal{T}_k \setminus \mathcal{T}_\perp).$$

We have $C \lesssim 1/\mu^2$ depending on the constants in (2.6b) *and* (2.7).

Proof. For a proof see [DKS15, Theorem 7.3]. □

Remark 2.7. *The proof of instance optimality in* [DKS15] *relies on* fine properties *of populations* [DKS15, §6] *(see Remark 2.2). These technical arguments are only used to conclude Theorem 2.6 from* (2.4), (2.6) *and* (2.7). *Therefore, we neglect them and refer the interested reader to* [DKS15].

A generalisation of populations and, hence, of Theorem 2.6 from two to higher dimensions is open.

3. Poisson Problem

In this section we show how a standard Crouzeix-Raviart finite element method for the Poisson problem fits into the framework of Section 2.

For $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, find the unique weak solution $u \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ of

$$-\Delta u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega \qquad \text{and} \qquad u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{3.1}$$

Here $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a bounded polygonal domain. For any open subset $\omega \subset \Omega$, we shall denote by $H^1(\omega)$ the usual Sobolev space of functions in $L^2(\omega)$ whose first derivatives are also in $L^2(\omega)$. Denoting the norm on $L^2(\omega)$ by $\|\cdot\|_\omega$, then, thanks to Friedrichs inequality, we have that $\|\nabla\cdot\|_\Omega$ is a norm on the space $H^1_0(\Omega)$ of functions in $H^1(\Omega)$ with zero trace on $\partial\Omega$.

3.1. Crouzeix-Raviart Finite Element Framework.

We shall first introduce the Crouzeix-Raviart discretisation of the Poisson problem and then provide some results, which are crucial in order to verify the assumptions needed to apply the abstract framework of Section 2.2.

For $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, we denote by $P_k(T)$ the space of polynomials of degree at most k on $T \in \mathcal{T}$. The P_1 nonconforming finite element space of Crouzeix and Raviart is defined by

$$\mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}) := \big\{ v_{\mathcal{T}} \in L^2(\Omega) \colon v_{\mathcal{T}}|_T \in P_1(T) \text{ a.e. in } T \in \mathcal{T}, \\ \text{and } \int_S [\![v_{\mathcal{T}}]\!] \,\mathrm{d}s = 0 \text{ for all } S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}) \big\}.$$

Here and throughout the paper, $[\![v_{\mathcal{T}}]\!]|_S := (v_{\mathcal{T}}|_{T_1} - v_{\mathcal{T}}|_{T_2})|_S$ denotes the jump of $v_{\mathcal{T}}$ across S when $S = T_1 \cap T_2 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$, and $[\![v_{\mathcal{T}}]\!]|_S = v_{\mathcal{T}}|_S$ if $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$ and $S \subset \partial\Omega$. Note that on interior edges this definition is only unique up to its sign, i.e., up to the choice of T_1 and T_2. However, we shall only use it to describe orientation independent properties. We define the subset of continuous functions by $\mathbb{V}_{\mathcal{T}} := \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}) \cap H^1_0(\Omega)$.

The discrete Poincaré inequality for piecewise H^1 functions [Bre03, BS08] guarantees that $\int_\Omega \nabla^{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \nabla^{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathtt{NC}} v_{\mathcal{T}} \,\mathrm{d}x$, $u_{\mathcal{T}}, v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T})$, is a scalar product. Here the nonconforming or piecewise gradient is defined by

$$(\nabla^{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathtt{NC}} v_{\mathcal{T}})|_T := \nabla(v_{\mathcal{T}}|_T) \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}.$$

We have that $\nabla^{\mathcal{T}_\star}_{\mathtt{NC}}|_{\mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T})} = \nabla^{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathtt{NC}}|_{\mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T})}$ when $\mathcal{T}_\star \geq \mathcal{T}$. In situations when there is no danger of confusion, we shall skip the dependence on the triangulation and simply write $\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}$. Thanks to the Riesz representation theorem, the Crouzeix-Raviart approximation $u_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T})$ to (3.1) is uniquely defined by

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} v_{\mathcal{T}} \,\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega f v_{\mathcal{T}} \,\mathrm{d}x \quad \text{for all } v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}). \tag{3.2}$$

Since

$$\inf_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}, \#\mathcal{T} \leq N} \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u - u_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega \to 0 \quad \text{as } N \to \infty \tag{3.3}$$

(compare e.g. with [Gud10]), we define $u_{\mathcal{T}^\top} := u$.

Next, we introduce the nonconforming interpolation operator

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} : \operatorname{span}\big(\{ \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}_\star) : \mathcal{T}_\star \geq \mathcal{T} \} \cup \{ H^1_0(\Omega) \} \big) \to \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T})$$

defined by

$$\int_S \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} v \,\mathrm{d}s := \int_S v \,\mathrm{d}s \qquad \text{for all } S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}). \tag{3.4}$$

Note that the right-hand side of (3.4) is always well-defined. Since $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} v$ is piecewise affine, we may equivalently define $(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} v)(\mathsf{mid}(S)) = \frac{1}{|S|} \int_S v \,\mathrm{d}s$, where $\mathsf{mid}(S)$ denotes the barycenter of $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$. Consequently, this operator is well defined since it determines exactly the degrees of freedom of the

Crouzeix-Raviart function. It satisfies the well known projection property [Ago94, Lemma 3.1]

$$\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}v)|_T = \frac{1}{|T|}\int_T \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} v \,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{3.5}$$

which directly implies $\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(v-\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}v)\|_\Omega \leq \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(v-v_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega$ for all $v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T})$. Moreover, we have the following approximation and stability properties

$$\frac{1}{\Lambda}\|h_{\mathcal{T}}^{-1}(v-\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}v)\|_T \leq \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(v-\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}v)\|_T \leq \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} v\|_T, \tag{3.6}$$

with $0 < \Lambda \leq 0.4396$ [CG14, Theorem 2.1]; this is a consequence of a discrete Friedrichs inequality [BS08] and a scaling argument. Since $\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} v_{\mathcal{T}}$ is piecewise constant on $\mathcal{T}$ for $v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T})$, we obtain as an immediate consequence of (3.5) that

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} v_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} v \,\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} v_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} v)\,\mathrm{d}x \tag{3.7}$$

for all $v \in H^1_0(\Omega) \cup \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ with $\mathcal{T}_\star \geq \mathcal{T}$.

In order to prove the equivalence in (2.6b), we shall also need some operator $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star} : \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}) \to \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ for $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_\star \in \mathbb{T}$, $\mathcal{T} \leq \mathcal{T}_\star$. Based on local averages, such an operator was recently introduced in [CGS13]. For our purposes, we need to slightly modify the construction of this so called transfer operator in order to avoid contributions on unrefined edges in the stability estimate of the following Theorem 3.1. The construction of $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}$ and the proof of Theorem 3.1 is deferred to the appendix.

Theorem 3.1 (transfer operator)**.** *Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \widehat{\mathbb{T}}$ with $\mathcal{T} \leq \mathcal{T}_\star$. There exists an operator $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star} : \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}) \to \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ with*

$$\|h_{\mathcal{T}}^{-1}(v_{\mathcal{T}} - \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star} v_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega^2 + \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(v_{\mathcal{T}} - \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star} v_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega^2 \lesssim \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})\setminus\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)} h_S \,\|[\![\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} v_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \boldsymbol{t}]\!]\|_S^2$$

for all $v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T})$. Here $\boldsymbol{t}$ denotes a tangential unit vector of S. Consequently, $[\![\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \boldsymbol{t}]\!]|_S$ denotes the tangential jump of $\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}}$ across interior sides $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$ with $S \not\subset \partial\Omega$ and the trace of the tangential derivative of $u_{\mathcal{T}}$ for boundary sides $S \subset \partial\Omega$.

Finally, we introduce a linear operator $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}} : \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}) \to H^1_0(\Omega)$ from [CGS, Proposition 2.3]. We shall use this operator in the proof of the lower diamond estimate (2.7) in Section 3.4 below. The construction is based on an interpolation into the space $\mathbb{V}_{\mathcal{T}} \subset H^1_0(\Omega)$ of piecewise affine continuous functions. Additional piecewise continuous quadratics are then used to guarantee some extra local mean property for the gradient.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$. There exists a linear operator $\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T} : \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}) \to H^1_0(\Omega)$ satisfying a local gradient mean property*

$$\int_T \nabla \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T} v_\mathcal{T} \,\mathrm{d}x = \int_T \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} v_\mathcal{T} \,\mathrm{d}x \qquad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T},\ v_\mathcal{T} \in \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T})$$

and the approximation and stability property

$$\|h_\mathcal{T}^{-1}(v_\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T} v_\mathcal{T})\|_\Omega + \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(v_\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T} v_\mathcal{T})\|_\Omega \lesssim \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} v_\mathcal{T}\|_\Omega.$$

Proof. Compare with Step 2 in the proof of [CGS, Proposition 2.3]. □

Let $\mathcal{T}_\star, \mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ with $\mathcal{T} \leq \mathcal{T}_\star$, then $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \circ \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T} : \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}) \to \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ and this composed operator has the following properties.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{T}_\star, \mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ with $\mathcal{T} \leq \mathcal{T}_\star$. Then for $v_\mathcal{T} \in \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T})$ the operator $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \circ \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T} : \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}) \to \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ satisfies the local gradient mean property*

$$\int_T \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \circ \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T}) v_\mathcal{T} \,\mathrm{d}x = \int_T \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} v_\mathcal{T} \,\mathrm{d}x \qquad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T},$$

the conservation property

$$(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \circ \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T}) v_\mathcal{T}|_T = v_\mathcal{T}|_T \qquad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_\star,$$

and the approximation and stability property

$$\|h_\mathcal{T}^{-1}(v_\mathcal{T} - (\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \circ \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T}) v_\mathcal{T})\|_\Omega + \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(v_\mathcal{T} - (\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \circ \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T}) v_\mathcal{T})\|_\Omega \lesssim \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} v_\mathcal{T}\|_\Omega.$$

Proof. The local gradient mean property is a direct consequence of (3.5) and Lemma 3.2. This also implies $(\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{T} \circ \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T}) = \mathrm{id}\,|_{\mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T})}$. Thanks to (3.4), we have $(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} v)|_T = (\mathcal{I}_\mathcal{T} v)|_T$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_\star$ and $v \in H^1_0(\Omega)$. This proves the conservation property. The approximation and stability property is a consequence of $v_\mathcal{T} - (\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \circ \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T}) v_\mathcal{T} = v_\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T} v_\mathcal{T} + \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T} v_\mathcal{T} - (\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \circ \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T}) v_\mathcal{T}$, a triangle inequality, the observation that $h_\mathcal{T}^{-1} \leq h_{\mathcal{T}_\star}^{-1}$, and the approximation and stability properties of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}$ and $\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T}$ in (3.6) and Lemma 3.2. □

3.2. **Energy.** For a fixed $\gamma > 2\Lambda^2 > 0$, with Λ from (3.6), we define the generalised energy $\mathcal{G} : \widehat{\mathbb{T}} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) := -\int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_\mathcal{T}|^2 - f u_\mathcal{T} \,\mathrm{d}x + \gamma \|h_\mathcal{T} f\|_\Omega^2$$

when $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ and

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}^\top) := -\int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}|\nabla u_{\mathcal{T}^\top}|^2 - f u_{\mathcal{T}^\top} \,\mathrm{d}x.$$

We emphasise that in the above definition of $\mathcal{G}$, the Dirichlet energy of the Crouzeix-Raviart approximation appears with a negative sign. In fact,

although the Crouzeix-Raviart finite element solution $u_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T})$ maximises $v_{\mathcal{T}} \mapsto -\int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} v_{\mathcal{T}}|^2 - f v_{\mathcal{T}}\,\mathrm{d}x$ in $\mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T})$, this expression is in general not increasing under refinement. This is due to the fact, that Crouzeix-Raviart spaces corresponding to nested triangulations are not nested, i.e., $\mathcal{T} \leq \mathcal{T}_\star$ does not imply $\mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}) \subset \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}_\star)$. It was observed in [CGS13, Proof of Theorem 6.5], however, that the energy $\mathcal{G}$ is even monotonically *decreasing* under refinement, thanks to the term $\|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|^2_\Omega$. The following results states a refined version of this observation.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \widehat{\mathbb{T}}$ with $\mathcal{T}_\star \geq \mathcal{T}$, then*

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) - \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}_\star) \eqsim \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - u_{\mathcal{T}})\|^2_\Omega + \|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|^2_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)}. \tag{3.8}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) - \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}^\top) \eqsim \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u - u_{\mathcal{T}})\|^2_\Omega + \mathrm{osc}(\mathcal{T})^2.$$

Here the oscillation is defined as

$$\mathrm{osc}(\mathcal{T})^2 := \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}} \int_T h_{\mathcal{T}}^2 |f - f_T|^2\,\mathrm{d}x \quad \text{with } f_T := \frac{1}{|T|}\int_T f\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Proof. In order to prove the first statement, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}&\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - u_{\mathcal{T}})\|^2_\Omega \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}|^2 - |\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}}|^2\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - u_{\mathcal{T}})\,\mathrm{d}x\end{aligned}$$

The integral mean property (3.7) and the discrete problem (3.2) imply

$$-\int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - u_{\mathcal{T}})\,\mathrm{d}x = -\int_\Omega f(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - u_{\mathcal{T}})\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - u_{\mathcal{T}})\|^2_\Omega &= \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}|^2 - f u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}}|^2 - f u_{\mathcal{T}}\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\quad + \int_\Omega f(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} u_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) - \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}_\star) - \gamma(\|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|^2_\Omega - \|h_{\mathcal{T}_\star} f\|^2_\Omega) \\ &\quad + \int_\Omega f(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} u_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\,\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Recalling the mesh-size reduction property (2.2), we have for the penultimate term that

$$\frac{1}{2}\|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|^2_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)} \leq \|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|^2_\Omega - \|h_{\mathcal{T}_\star} f\|^2_\Omega \leq \|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|^2_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)}. \tag{3.10}$$

Thanks to the definition of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}$ in (3.4), we have that $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}|_T = u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}|_T$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_\star$. Therefore, we can bound the last term in (3.9) by

$$\begin{aligned}\Big| \int_\Omega f(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}) \,\mathrm{d}x \Big| &= \Big| \int_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)} f(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}) \,\mathrm{d}x \Big| \\ &\leq \Lambda^2 \|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|^2_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)} + \frac{1}{4\Lambda^2} \|h_{\mathcal{T}}^{-1}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} u_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\|^2_\Omega.\end{aligned}$$

Here we used a scaled Young's inequality in the last step. Then (3.6) implies

(3.11)
$$\Big| \int_\Omega f(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}) \,\mathrm{d}x \Big| \leq \Lambda^2 \|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|^2_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)} + \frac{1}{4} \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} u_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\|^2_\Omega.$$

Combining (3.9), (3.10) and (3.11) yields

(3.12)
$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{4}\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - u_{\mathcal{T}})\|^2_\Omega + \big(\frac{\gamma}{2} - \Lambda^2\big) \|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|^2_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)} \\ \leq \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) - \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}_\star) \\ \leq \frac{3}{4}\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - u_{\mathcal{T}})\|^2_\Omega + (\gamma + \Lambda^2) \|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|^2_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)}.\end{aligned}$$

This proves the first equivalence (3.8) for $\gamma > 2\Lambda^2$.

In order to prove the second claim, we observe that the term $\|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|^2_\Omega$ corresponds to the element residual in a scaled L^2-norm. Therefore, we can use Verfürth's bubble function technique (see e.g. [Ver13, §1.4.5]), in order to obtain the efficiency estimate

$$\|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|^2_\Omega \lesssim \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u - u_{\mathcal{T}})\|^2_\Omega + \operatorname{osc}(\mathcal{T})^2,$$

and the asserted estimate is a consequence of the first claim. □

3.3. **Error Bounds.** We define local error indicators on sides of $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ by

$$\mathcal{E}^2_{\mathcal{T}}(S) := \|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|^2_{\omega_S^{\mathcal{T}}} + h_S \|[\![\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \boldsymbol{t}]\!]\|^2_S, \quad S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$$

and set

$$\mathcal{E}^2_{\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}) := \sum_{S \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \mathcal{E}^2_{\mathcal{T}}(S) \quad \text{for } \tilde{\mathcal{S}} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}).$$

We have the following relation between the estimator and some quasi-error.

Theorem 3.5. *For $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \widehat{\mathbb{T}}$ with $\mathcal{T} \leq \mathcal{T}_\star$, we have*

$$\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}} - u_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\|^2_\Omega + \|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|^2_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)} \eqsim \mathcal{E}^2_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}) \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)).$$

Before we turn to prove Theorem 3.5, we observe that, as a consequence of Theorem 3.5 and Lemma 3.4, the error estimator is equivalent to the energy difference.

Corollary 3.6. *For $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \widehat{\mathbb{T}}$ with $\mathcal{T} \leq \mathcal{T}_\star$, we have*

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) - \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}_\star) \eqsim \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}^2(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}) \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)).$$

Proof of Theorem 3.5. The proof is split into two parts. To prove $\gtrsim$, we follow [CGS, Lemma 5.3] and assume without loss of generality, that $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \mathbb{T}$. The case $\mathcal{T}_\star = \mathcal{T}^\top$ is then a consequence of (3.3). Let $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}) \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ and let ϕ_S be the piecewise affine continuation of $\phi_S(\mathsf{mid}(S)) = 1$ and $\phi_S|_{\Omega \setminus \omega_S^{\mathcal{T}}} \equiv 0$. Note that if $S \subset \partial\Omega$, then $\phi_S|_S \not\equiv 0$ and thus $\phi_S \notin \mathbb{V}_{\mathcal{T}}$. Since $[\![\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \boldsymbol{t}]\!]|_S$ is constant on S, an integration by parts together with $\int_S \phi_S \,\mathrm{d}s = \frac{1}{2} h_S$ yields

$$\frac{1}{2} h_S^{1/2} \|[\![\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \boldsymbol{t}]\!]\|_S = |\int_S \phi_S [\![\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \boldsymbol{t}]\!] \,\mathrm{d}s| = |\int_{\omega_S^{\mathcal{T}}} \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \mathrm{Curl} \phi_S \,\mathrm{d}x|.$$

Piecewise integration by parts reveals the L^2 orthogonality $\mathrm{Curl}\phi_S \perp_{L^2(\Omega)} \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} \mathrm{CR}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ [AF89, Theorem 4.1]. This leads for any $v_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \in \mathrm{CR}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ to

$$|\int_{\omega_S^{\mathcal{T}}} \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \mathrm{Curl} \phi_S \,\mathrm{d}x| = |\int_{\omega_S^{\mathcal{T}}} \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} (u_{\mathcal{T}} - v_{\mathcal{T}_\star}) \cdot \mathrm{Curl} \phi_S \,\mathrm{d}x|.$$

Combining the previous equalities with a Cauchy inequality and the scaling $\|\mathrm{Curl}\phi_S\|_\Omega \eqsim 1$ we obtain for $v_{\mathcal{T}_\star} = u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}$ that

$$h_S^{1/2} \|[\![\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \boldsymbol{t}]\!]\|_S \lesssim \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} (u_{\mathcal{T}} - u_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\|_{\omega_S^{\mathcal{T}}}.$$

We turn to prove $\lesssim$. Consider $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \mathbb{T}$ and let $v_{\mathcal{T}_\star} = \arg\min\{\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}} - w_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\|_\Omega : w_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \in \mathrm{CR}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_\star)\}$. This implies

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} (u_{\mathcal{T}} - v_{\mathcal{T}_\star}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} w_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \,\mathrm{d}x = 0 \qquad \text{for all } w_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \in \mathrm{CR}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_\star). \tag{3.13}$$

Then the Pythagorean theorem reads

$$\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} (u_{\mathcal{T}} - u_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\|_\Omega^2 = \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} (u_{\mathcal{T}} - v_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\|_\Omega^2 + \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} (v_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - u_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\|_\Omega^2. \tag{3.14}$$

For the second term on the right-hand side, we obtain thanks to (3.13) and the discrete problem (3.2) for $w_{\mathcal{T}_\star} := v_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \in \mathrm{CR}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_\star)$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} (v_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - u_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\|_\Omega^2 &= \int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} w_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega f w_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \int_\Omega f(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} w_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - w_{\mathcal{T}_\star}) \,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Here we used property (3.7) of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}$ in the last step. Moreover, we have by (3.4) that $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} w_{\mathcal{T}_\star} = w_{\mathcal{T}_\star}$ on $\Omega(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}_\star)$ and thus

$$\int_\Omega f(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} w_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - w_{\mathcal{T}_\star}) \,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim \|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star)} \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} w_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\|_\Omega.$$

For the first-term on the right-hand side of (3.14), we have by the definition of $v_{\mathcal{T}_\star}$ and Theorem 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}}-v_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\|_\Omega^2 &\leq \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}}-\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}u_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega^2\\ &\lesssim \sum_{S\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})\setminus\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)} h_S\|[\![\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}u_{\mathcal{T}}\cdot\boldsymbol{t}]\!]\|_S^2.\end{aligned}$$

A combination of the above bounds with (3.14) proves the assertion.

The same arguments apply for $\mathcal{T}_\star=\mathcal{T}^\top$. □

3.4. **Lower Diamond Estimates.** For the conforming method in [DKS15], the lower diamond estimate (2.7) is a consequence of the fact that the finite element solutions are best approximations together with properties of a locally defined stable quasi-interpolation operator. For non-conforming Crouzeix-Raviart solutions of (3.2), however, we have a best approximation property only in the following sense.

Lemma 3.7 (quasi best approximation)**.** *For $\mathcal{T},\mathcal{T}_\star\in\mathbb{T}$ with $\mathcal{T}\leq\mathcal{T}_\star$, we have*

$$\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}-u_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega \lesssim \min_{v_{\mathcal{T}}\in\mathrm{CR}_0^1(\mathcal{T})}\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}-v_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega + \|h_{\mathcal{T}}f\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)}.$$

Proof. The projection property of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}$ and the Pythagorean theorem imply

$$\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}-u_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega^2 = \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}-\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}u_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\|_\Omega^2 + \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}-u_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega^2.$$

Since $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}$ is the best approximation of $u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}$ with respect to $\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}\cdot\|_\Omega$ in $\mathrm{CR}_0^1(\mathcal{T})$, it suffices to estimate the second term on the right-hand side. Using the abbreviation $\varphi_{\mathcal{T}}:=\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}-u_{\mathcal{T}}\in\mathrm{CR}_0^1(\mathcal{T})$, we have by (3.2) and (3.7) that

$$\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}-u_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega^2 = \int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\cdot\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}\varphi_{\mathcal{T}}\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega f\,\varphi_{\mathcal{T}}\,\mathrm{d}x \tag{3.16}$$

and by $(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\circ\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}})\varphi_{\mathcal{T}}\in\mathrm{CR}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ and again (3.2)

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\cdot\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}\varphi_{\mathcal{T}}\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega f\,\varphi_{\mathcal{T}}\,\mathrm{d}x &= \int_\Omega f\,((\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\circ\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}})\varphi_{\mathcal{T}}-\varphi_{\mathcal{T}})\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\quad+\int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\cdot\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\varphi_{\mathcal{T}}-(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\circ\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}})\varphi_{\mathcal{T}})\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\quad+\int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}-u_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\cdot\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\circ\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}})\varphi_{\mathcal{T}}\,\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

Thanks to the approximation property and the conservation property in Lemma 3.3, we can bound the first term on the right-hand side by

$$\int_\Omega f\,((\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\circ\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}})\varphi_{\mathcal{T}}-\varphi_{\mathcal{T}})\,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim \|h_{\mathcal{T}}f\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)}\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}\varphi_{\mathcal{T}}\|_\Omega.$$

The gradient mean property of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \circ \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}}$ implies that the second term on the right-hand side vanishes. Finally, for the third term the stability of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \circ \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}}$ yields

$$\int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \circ \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}}) \varphi_{\mathcal{T}} \,\mathrm{d}x \lesssim \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - u_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\|_\Omega \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} \varphi_{\mathcal{T}}\|_\Omega.$$

Combining these bounds proves the assertion. □

Remark 3.8. *Lemma 3.7 can be proved similarly by replacing $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \circ \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}}$ by the transfer operator $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}$. However, the proof of a quasi best approximation property for the Stokes equations in Lemma 4.5 below requires the additional integral mean property of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \circ \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}}$ from Lemma 3.3.*

As a consequence of Lemma 3.7, we have a lower diamond estimate for the energy defined in Section 3.2.

Theorem 3.9 (lower diamond estimate)**.** *The generalised energy $\mathcal{G}$ from Section 3.2 satisfies the lower diamond estimate* (2.7)*.*

Proof. Let $(\mathcal{T}^\wedge, \mathcal{T}_\vee; \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_m)$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, be a lower diamond in $\mathbb{T}$. The set $\mathcal{T}_\vee \setminus \mathcal{T}_j$ denotes the elements in $\mathcal{T}_\vee$, which are coarsened in $\mathcal{T}_j$. By Definition 2.1 we have that the corresponding areas $\Omega(\mathcal{T}_j \setminus \mathcal{T}_\vee) = \Omega(\mathcal{T}_\vee \setminus \mathcal{T}_j)$ are pairwise disjoint, i.e., the necessary coarsenings from $\mathcal{T}_\vee$ to $\mathcal{T}_j$ for each j take place in different regions of Ω and are independent of each other. Since $\mathcal{T}^\wedge$ is the finest common coarsening and $\mathcal{T}_\vee$ is the coarsest common refinement of $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_m$, we have that $\mathcal{T}^\wedge$ can be obtained from $\mathcal{T}_\vee$ by performing exactly the coarsenings from $\mathcal{T}_\vee$ to $\mathcal{T}_j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, m$. This implies that $\bigcup_{j=1}^m (\mathcal{T}_j \setminus \mathcal{T}_\vee) = \mathcal{T}^\wedge \setminus \mathcal{T}_\vee$, where the union is disjoint.

Therefore, we obtain with $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge} u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee} = u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}$ on $\Omega(\mathcal{T}^\wedge \cap \mathcal{T}_\vee)$, that

$$\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge} u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee})\|_\Omega^2 = \sum_{j=1}^m \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge} u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee})\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}_j \setminus \mathcal{T}_\vee)}^2.$$

Thanks to $\mathcal{T}_j \setminus \mathcal{T}_\vee \subset \mathcal{T}^\wedge$, we have $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge} u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee} = \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_j} u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}$ on $\Omega(\mathcal{T}_j \setminus \mathcal{T}_\vee)$, whence

$$\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge} u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee})\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}_j \setminus \mathcal{T}_\vee)}^2 = \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_j} u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee})\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}_j \setminus \mathcal{T}_\vee)}^2.$$

Moreover, since $\mathcal{T}_j \cap \mathcal{T}_\vee \subset \mathcal{T}_\vee$, it follows that $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_j} u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee} = u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}$ on $\Omega(\mathcal{T}_\vee \cap \mathcal{T}_j)$. Combining these observations we arrive at

$$\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge} u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee})\|_\Omega^2 = \sum_{j=1}^m \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_j} u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee})\|_\Omega^2. \tag{3.18}$$

Again, since the union $\bigcup_{j=1}^m (\mathcal{T}_j \setminus \mathcal{T}_\vee) = \mathcal{T}^\wedge \setminus \mathcal{T}_\vee$ is disjoint we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \|h_{\mathcal{T}_j} f\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}_j \setminus \mathcal{T}_\vee)}^2 = \|h_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge} f\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}^\wedge \setminus \mathcal{T}_\vee)}^2. \tag{3.19}$$

Therefore, Lemma 3.7 applied to $\mathcal{T}^\wedge$, implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee} - u_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge})\|_\Omega^2 + \|h_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge} f\|^2_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}^\wedge\setminus\mathcal{T}_\vee)} \\
&\qquad\eqsim \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge} u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee})\|_\Omega^2 + \|h_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge} f\|^2_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}^\wedge\setminus\mathcal{T}_\vee)} \\
&\qquad= \sum_{j=1}^m \Big(\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_j} u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee})\|_\Omega^2 + \|h_{\mathcal{T}_j} f\|^2_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}_j\setminus\mathcal{T}_\vee)}\Big) \qquad (3.20)\\
&\qquad\eqsim \sum_{j=1}^m \Big(\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\vee} - u_{\mathcal{T}_j})\|_\Omega^2 + \|h_{\mathcal{T}_j} f\|^2_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}_j\setminus\mathcal{T}_\vee)}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

The equivalence of the discrete errors and the energy difference (Lemma 3.4) yields the assertion. □

3.5. **Instance Optimality of AFEM for the Poisson Problem.** The following result is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.6 and Lemma 3.4.

Theorem 3.10. *Let $\{\mathcal{T}_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ be the sequence of triangulations produced by Algorithm 2.1 with the energy of Section 3.2 and the estimator of Section 3.3. Then there exist constants $C, \tilde{C} \geq 1$, such that*

$$\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u - u_{\mathcal{T}_k})\|_\Omega^2 + \operatorname{osc}(\mathcal{T}_k)^2 \leq \tilde{C}\big(\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u - u_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega^2 + \operatorname{osc}(\mathcal{T})^2\big)$$

for all $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ with

$$C\#(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\perp) \leq \#(\mathcal{T}_k\setminus\mathcal{T}_\perp).$$

We have $C \lesssim 1/\mu^2$ depending on the constants in Corollary 3.6 and Theorem 3.9. The constant $\tilde{C}$ depends on the constants in Lemma 3.4.

Proof. The preceding considerations (Lemma 3.4, Corollary 3.6, and Theorem 3.9) verified the assumptions (2.4), (2.6), and (2.7) and therefore the conditions of Theorem 2.6 and thus, the assertion follows from Lemma 3.4. □

Remark 3.11 (non-constant diffusion)**.** *Consider the problem $-\operatorname{div} A\nabla u = f$ with invertible piecewise constant (with respect to $\mathcal{T}_\perp$) $A \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{2\times 2}_{sym})$. Then the generalised energy*

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) := -\int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot A\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}} - f u_{\mathcal{T}}\,\mathrm{d}x + \widetilde{\gamma}\|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|_\Omega^2$$

for some $\widetilde{\gamma}$ depending on A and Λ from (3.6) is monotonically decreasing and satisfies the lower diamond estimate. The error indicator

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}^2(S) := \|h_{\mathcal{T}} f\|^2_{\omega_S^{\mathcal{T}}} + h_S\|[\![\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \boldsymbol{t}]\!]\|_S^2, \quad S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$$

satisfies the two-sided error bounds (2.6). The proofs of those properties follow in the same way as for the Poisson problem with the additional property

$$\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - u_{\mathcal{T}})\|_T^2 \eqsim \int_T \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - u_{\mathcal{T}}) \cdot A\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - u_{\mathcal{T}})\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Hence, the corresponding adaptive algorithm is instance optimal.

If A is not piecewise constant, (3.7) *would involve additional oscillation terms. It is unclear how to handle those terms in the proof of instance optimality.*

4. Stokes Problem

One advantage of a Crouzeix-Raviart discretisation of the Stokes problem is that the velocity approximation is piecewise exactly divergence free, whence the discrete problem corresponds to an energy minimising problem. We use this fact in order to show that the discrete setting fits into the framework of Section 2 thereby yielding instance optimality of an AFEM with modified maximum strategy (Algorithm 2.1). The used techniques are similar to the techniques in Section 3 for the Poisson problem. We therefore sketch the proofs and only present the differences in detail.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded polygonal domain. For $\boldsymbol{f} \in L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2)$, we seek $\boldsymbol{u} \in H^1_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $p \in L^2_0(\Omega) := \{q \in L^2(\Omega) : \int_\Omega q \,\mathrm{d}x = 0\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \nabla \boldsymbol{u} : \nabla \boldsymbol{v} \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega p \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{v} \,\mathrm{d}x &= \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{f} \cdot \boldsymbol{v} \,\mathrm{d}x \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{v} \in H^1_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2), \\ \int_\Omega q \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{u} \,\mathrm{d}x &= 0 \qquad\qquad\quad \text{for all } q \in L^2_0(\Omega) \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

with the scalar product $A : B := \sum_{j,k=1}^2 A_{jk} B_{jk}$. The inf-sup condition

$$\|q\|_\Omega \lesssim \sup_{\boldsymbol{v} \in H^1_0(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2)} \frac{\int_\Omega q \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{v} \,\mathrm{d}x}{\|\nabla \boldsymbol{v}\|_\Omega} \qquad \text{for all } q \in L^2_0(\Omega) \tag{4.2}$$

guarantees the existence of a unique solution to (4.1); see e.g. [GR86, BF91].

4.1. Crouzeix-Raviart Finite Element Framework.

For $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ denote the discrete velocity space by $V_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{T}) := \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T}) \times \mathrm{CR}^1_0(\mathcal{T})$ and the discrete pressure space by $\mathrm{Q}_0(\mathcal{T}) := \{q_\mathcal{T} \in L^2(\Omega) : q|_T \in P_0(T),\ T \in \mathcal{T}\}$. The approximation $\boldsymbol{u}_\mathcal{T} \in V_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{T})$ and $p_\mathcal{T} \in \mathrm{Q}_0(\mathcal{T}) \cap L^2_0(\Omega)$ of (4.1) is then given by

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} \boldsymbol{u}_\mathcal{T} : \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} \boldsymbol{v}_\mathcal{T} \,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega p_\mathcal{T} \operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}} \boldsymbol{v}_\mathcal{T} \,\mathrm{d}x &= \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{f} \cdot \boldsymbol{v}_\mathcal{T} \,\mathrm{d}x, \\ \int_\Omega q_\mathcal{T} \operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}} \boldsymbol{u}_\mathcal{T} \,\mathrm{d}x &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{v}_\mathcal{T} \in V_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{T})$ and all $q_\mathcal{T} \in \mathrm{Q}_0(\mathcal{T}) \cap L^2_0(\Omega)$. The piecewise divergence is defined as $\operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}} \boldsymbol{v}_\mathcal{T} = \operatorname{tr} \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} \boldsymbol{v}_\mathcal{T} \in \mathrm{Q}_0(\mathcal{T}) \cap L^2_0(\Omega)$ (with the trace operator $\operatorname{tr}(A) = A_{11} + A_{22}$), whence $\operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}} \boldsymbol{u}_\mathcal{T} = 0$ pointwise. The discrete counter

part

$$\|q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_\Omega \lesssim \sup_{\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}}\in V_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{T})} \frac{\int_\Omega q_{\mathcal{T}} \operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}} \boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}}\,\mathrm{d}x}{\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_\Omega} \quad \text{for all } q_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathrm{Q}_0(\mathcal{T}) \cap L^2_0(\Omega) \tag{4.4}$$

of (4.2) guarantees the unique existence of a solution to (4.3); see [CR73]. As in Section 3, we define $\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}^\top} := \boldsymbol{u}$ and $p_{\mathcal{T}^\top} := p$.

The operators $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}$, $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}$, and $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}}$ can be generalised to two dimensions by a component-wise application thereby maintaining the properties presented in Section 3.1. Since there is no danger of confusion, we adopt the notation for scalar functions, e.g. the estimate (3.6) in this context is understood with vector valued functions.

4.2. **Energy.** Let $\gamma > 2\Lambda^2 > 0$. Similarly as in Section 3.2, we define the generalised energy by

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) := -\int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}}|^2 - \boldsymbol{f}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\,\mathrm{d}x + \gamma\|h_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{f}\|_\Omega^2$$

when $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ and

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}^\top) := -\int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}^\top}|^2 - \boldsymbol{f}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}^\top}\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

The following lemma bounds the pressure error by the error of the velocity plus a suitable volume term; see also [DDP95, Remark 3.2]. This allows to consider the error of the velocity as the essential part in the analysis below.

Lemma 4.1. *For $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \widehat{\mathbb{T}}$ with $\mathcal{T} \le \mathcal{T}_\star$ we have*

$$\|p_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - p_{\mathcal{T}}\|_\Omega \lesssim \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega + \|h_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)}.$$

Proof. Assume that $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \mathbb{T}$. Thanks to the discrete inf-sup condition (4.4), there exists $\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \in V_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ with $\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\|_\Omega = 1$ and

$$\|p_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - p_{\mathcal{T}}\|_\Omega \lesssim \int_\Omega (p_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - p_{\mathcal{T}}) \operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}} \boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{4.5}$$

The gradient mean property (3.5) (compare also with (3.7)) and the discrete problem (4.3) applied to $\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}$ and $p_{\mathcal{T}_\star}$ with test function $\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}$ as well as $u_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $p_{\mathcal{T}}$ with test function $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}$ lead to

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega (p_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - p_{\mathcal{T}}) \operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}} \boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\,\mathrm{d}x \\ = \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{f}\cdot(\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}})\cdot\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\,\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

Since $(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star})|_T = \boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}|_T$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}\cap\mathcal{T}_\star$, the assertion follows from a Cauchy inequality and the approximation property (3.6) of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}$. For $\mathcal{T}_\star = \mathcal{T}^\top$, the assertion follows analogously. □

We next relate the energy difference to the error; compare also with Lemma 3.4.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \widehat{\mathbb{T}}$ with $\mathcal{T}_\star \geq \mathcal{T}$, then*

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) - \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}_\star) \eqsim \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega^2 + \|h_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)}^2.$$

Moreover, we have

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) - \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}^\top) \eqsim \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega^2 + \|p - p_{\mathcal{T}}\|_\Omega^2 + \operatorname{osc}(\mathcal{T})^2,$$

where the oscillation is defined as

$$\operatorname{osc}(\mathcal{T})^2 := \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}} \int_T h_{\mathcal{T}}^2 |\boldsymbol{f} - \boldsymbol{f}_T|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \quad \text{with } \boldsymbol{f}_T := \frac{1}{|T|}\int_T \boldsymbol{f}\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Proof. Since $\int_T \operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}} \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}} u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_T \operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}} u_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\,\mathrm{d}x = 0$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}$, the proof of the first claim is a straight forward generalisation of the first statement in Lemma 3.4.

Verfürth's bubble function technique leads to the efficiency of the volume residual for the Stokes equations

$$\|h_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{f}\|_\Omega^2 \lesssim \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega^2 + \|p - p_{\mathcal{T}}\|_\Omega^2 + \operatorname{osc}(\mathcal{T})^2;$$

see [DDP95, Theorem 3.2]. This, Lemma 4.1 and the first claim proves the Lemma. □

4.3. **Error Bounds.** For $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ we define local error indicators on sides $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$ by

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}^2(S) := \|h_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\omega_S^{\mathcal{T}}}^2 + h_S\|[\![\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{t}]\!]\|_S^2 \quad \text{and set} \quad \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}^2(\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}) := \sum_{S\in\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}} \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}^2(S)$$

for $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$. The following theorem states the equivalence of the error estimator to the so-called quasi-error; cf. Theorem 3.5.

Theorem 4.3. *Any $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \widehat{\mathbb{T}}$ with $\mathcal{T} \leq \mathcal{T}_\star$ satisfy*

$$\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\|_\Omega^2 + \|h_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)} \eqsim \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}^2(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}) \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)).$$

As in Section 3.3, we observe the following equivalence, which is an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.3 and Lemma 4.2.

Corollary 4.4. *For $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \widehat{\mathbb{T}}$ with $\mathcal{T} \leq \mathcal{T}_\star$, we have*

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}) - \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{T}_\star) \eqsim \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{T}}^2(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}) \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)).$$

Proof of Theorem 4.3. The claim $\gtrsim$ follows analogously to the corresponding claim in Theorem 3.5.

In order to prove the converse direction $\lesssim$, consider first $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \mathbb{T}$ and define $\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} := \arg\min\{\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}} - \boldsymbol{w}_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\|_\Omega : \boldsymbol{w}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \in V_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{T}_\star)\}$. As in the proof of Theorem 3.5 it suffices to bound $\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\|_\Omega^2$; see also (3.14). Note

that $\operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}} \boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \neq 0$ in general, whence for $\boldsymbol{w}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} := \boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} \in V_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{T}_\star)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\|_\Omega^2 &= \int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}\boldsymbol{w}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\,\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{f}\cdot\boldsymbol{w}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - p_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}}\boldsymbol{w}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &= \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{f}\cdot(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{w}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \boldsymbol{w}_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_\Omega (p_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - p_{\mathcal{T}})\operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}}\boldsymbol{w}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\,\mathrm{d}x\end{aligned}$$

instead of (3.15). Since $\operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}} \boldsymbol{w}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} = \operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}} \boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} = \operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}})$, a scaled Young inequality with $\varepsilon > 0$ yields

$$\int_\Omega (p_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - p_{\mathcal{T}})\operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}}\boldsymbol{w}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\|p_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - p_{\mathcal{T}}\|_\Omega^2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega^2.$$

Bounding the pressure difference on the right-hand side with the help of Lemma 4.1, we obtain for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_\Omega (p_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - p_{\mathcal{T}})\operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}}\boldsymbol{w}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\qquad \leq \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega^2/2 + C(\|h_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)}^2 + \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega^2)\end{aligned}$$

for some $C = C(\varepsilon) > 0$. The first term can be absorbed on the left-hand side of (3.14) and the assertion follows as in the proof of Theorem 3.5.

For $\mathcal{T}_\star = \mathcal{T}^\top$ the claim follows analogously. □

4.4. **Lower Diamond Estimates.** In this section, we aim to prove the lower diamond estimate (2.7) for the energy defined in Section 4.2. In contrast to the lower diamond estimate for the Poisson problem in Section 3.4, the quasi best approximation property involves the pressure.

Lemma 4.5 (quasi best approximation)**.** *Let $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_\star \in \mathbb{T}$ with $\mathcal{T} \leq \mathcal{T}_\star$, then*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega \lesssim \inf_{\boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}}\in V_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{T})} &\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \boldsymbol{v}_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega + \|h_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\star)}\\ &+ \|p_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}}p_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\|_\Omega,\end{aligned}$$

where $\Pi_{\mathcal{T}} : L^2(\Omega) \to L^2(\Omega)$ is the L^2-projection onto $\mathrm{Q}_0(\mathcal{T})$.

Proof. We recall from the proof of Lemma 3.7, that it suffices to bound the term $\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega^2$. To this end note that for $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{\mathcal{T}} := \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}} \in V_{\mathrm{CR}}(\mathcal{T})$ we have $\operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\circ\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}})\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{\mathcal{T}} \not\equiv 0$ in general. Therefore, instead of

(3.16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}-\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega^2 &= \int_\Omega \boldsymbol{f}\cdot((\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\circ\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}})\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{\mathcal{T}}-\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{\mathcal{T}})\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\quad+\int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\cdot\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{\mathcal{T}}-(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\circ\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}})\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{\mathcal{T}})\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\quad+\int_\Omega \nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}-\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\cdot\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\circ\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}})\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{\mathcal{T}}\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\quad-\int_\Omega p_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\circ\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}})\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{\mathcal{T}}\,\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

The first three terms on the right-hand side can be estimated as in the proof of Lemma 3.7. For the last term, we obtain with the gradient mean property and the stability property of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\circ\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}}$ (see Lemma 3.2), that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega p_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\circ\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}})\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{\mathcal{T}}\,\mathrm{d}x &= \int_\Omega (p_{\mathcal{T}_\star}-\Pi_{\mathcal{T}}p_{\mathcal{T}_\star})\operatorname{div}_{\mathtt{NC}}(\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\circ\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}})\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{\mathcal{T}}\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\lesssim \|p_{\mathcal{T}_\star}-\Pi_{\mathcal{T}}p_{\mathcal{T}_\star}\|_\Omega\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_\Omega.\end{aligned}$$

This and the arguments of the proof of Lemma 3.7 imply the assertion. □

Theorem 4.6 (lower diamond estimate)**.** *The generalised energy $\mathcal{G}$ from Section 4.2 satisfies the lower diamond estimate* (2.7)*.*

Proof. Let $(\mathcal{T}^\wedge,\mathcal{T}_\vee;\mathcal{T}_1,\dots,\mathcal{T}_m)$, $m\in\mathbb{N}$, be a lower diamond in $\mathbb{T}$. We recall the definition of the L^2 projection in Lemma 4.5 and observe that $\Pi_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge}p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}|_T=p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}|_T$ when $T\in\mathcal{T}_\vee\cap\mathcal{T}^\wedge$. Since the union $\mathcal{T}^\wedge\setminus\mathcal{T}_\vee=\cup_{j=1}^m\mathcal{T}_j\setminus\mathcal{T}_\vee$ is disjoint, we have

$$\|p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}-\Pi_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge}p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}\|_\Omega^2=\sum_{j=1}^m\|p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}-\Pi_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge}p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}_j\setminus\mathcal{T}_\vee)}^2=\sum_{j=1}^m\|p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}-\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_j}p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}\|_\Omega^2,$$

where we have used $\Pi_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge}p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}|_T=\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_j}p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}|_T$ for $T\in\mathcal{T}^\wedge\cap\mathcal{T}_j$ in the last step. This, (3.18) and (3.19) imply the equality

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}-\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge}\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\vee})\|_\Omega^2+\|h_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge}\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}^\wedge\setminus\mathcal{T}_\vee)}^2+\|p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}-\Pi_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge}p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}\|_\Omega^2\\ &\quad=\sum_{j=1}^m\Big(\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}-\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_j}\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\vee})\|_\Omega^2+\|h_{\mathcal{T}_j}\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}_j\setminus\mathcal{T}_\vee)}^2+\|p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}-\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_j}p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}\|_\Omega^2\Big).\end{aligned}$$

The quasi best approximation property of Lemma 4.5 implies

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}-\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge})\|_\Omega^2+\|h_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge}\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}^\wedge\setminus\mathcal{T}_\vee)}^2+\|p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}-\Pi_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge}p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}\|_\Omega^2\\ &\quad\eqsim\sum_{j=1}^m\Big(\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}-\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_j})\|_\Omega^2+\|h_{\mathcal{T}_j}\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}_j\setminus\mathcal{T}_\vee)}^2+\|p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}-\Pi_{\mathcal{T}_j}p_{\mathcal{T}_\vee}\|_\Omega^2\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.1 then yields

$$\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\vee} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge})\|_\Omega^2 + \|h_{\mathcal{T}^\wedge}\boldsymbol{f}\|^2_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}^\wedge\setminus\mathcal{T}_\vee)} \eqsim \sum_{j=1}^m \Big(\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(\boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_\vee} - \boldsymbol{u}_{\mathcal{T}_j})\|_\Omega^2 + \|h_{\mathcal{T}_j}\boldsymbol{f}\|^2_{\Omega(\mathcal{T}_j\setminus\mathcal{T}_\vee)}\Big)$$

and thus the assertion follows from Lemma 4.2. □

4.5. **Instance Optimality of AFEM for the Stokes Problem.** The following result is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.6 and Lemma 4.2.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $\{\mathcal{T}_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ be the sequence of triangulations produced by Algorithm 2.1 with the energy of Section 4.2 and the estimator of Section 4.3. There exist constants $C, \tilde{C} \geq 1$, such that*

$$\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u - u_{\mathcal{T}_k})\|_\Omega^2 + \|p - p_{\mathcal{T}_k}\|_\Omega^2 + \operatorname{osc}(\mathcal{T}_k)^2 \leq \tilde{C}\big(\|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u - u_{\mathcal{T}})\|_\Omega^2 + \|p - p_{\mathcal{T}}\|_\Omega^2 + \operatorname{osc}(\mathcal{T})^2\big)$$

for all $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ with

$$C\#(\mathcal{T}\setminus\mathcal{T}_\perp) \leq \#(\mathcal{T}_k\setminus\mathcal{T}_\perp).$$

We have $C \lesssim 1/\mu^2$ depending on the constants in Corollary 4.4 and Theorem 4.6. The constant $\tilde{C}$ depends on the constants in Lemma 4.2.

Proof. The preceding considerations of Section 4 (Lemma 4.2, Corollary 4.4, and Theorem 4.6) verified the assumptions (2.4), (2.6), and (2.7) and therefore the conditions of Theorem 2.6 and thus, the assertion follows from Lemma 4.2. □

References

[Ago94] A. Agouzal, *A posteriori error estimator for nonconforming finite element methods*, Appl. Math. Lett. **7** (1994), no. 5, 61–66.

[AF89] D. N. Arnold and R. S. Falk, *A uniformly accurate finite element method for the Reissner-Mindlin plate*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **26** (1989), no. 6, 1276–1290.

[Bän91] E. Bänsch, *Local mesh refinement in 2 and 3 dimensions*, IMPACT Comput. Sci. Engrg. **3** (1991), 181–191.

[BDD04] P. Binev, W. Dahmen, and R. DeVore, *Adaptive finite element methods with convergence rates*, Numer. Math **97** (2004), 219–268.

[BDK12] L. Belenki, L. Diening, and C. Kreuzer, *Quasi-optimality of an adaptive finite element method for the p-Laplacian equation*, IMA J. Numer. Anal. **32** (2012), no. 2, 484–510.

[BF91] F. Brezzi and M. Fortin, *Mixed and hybrid finite element methods*, Springer Series in Computational Mathematics 15, 1991.

[Bin07] P. Binev, *Adaptive methods and near-best tree approximation*, Oberwolfach Reports, vol. 29, 2007, pp. 1669–1673.

[BM11] R. Becker and S. Mao, *Quasi-optimality of adaptive nonconforming finite element methods for the Stokes equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **49** (2011), no. 3, 970–991.

[BMS10] R. Becker, S. Mao, and Z. Shi, *A convergent nonconforming adaptive finite element method with quasi-optimal complexity*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **47** (2010), no. 6, 4639–4659.

[BN10] A. Bonito and R. H. Nochetto, *Quasi-optimal convergence rate of an adaptive discontinuous Galerkin method*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **48** (2010), no. 2, 734–771.

[BFH14] D. Braess, T. Fraunholz and R. H. W. Hoppe, *An equilibrated a posteriori error estimator for the interior penalty discontinuous Galerkin method*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **52** (2014), no. 4, 2121–2136.

[Bre03] S. C. Brenner, *Poincaré-Friedrichs inequalities for piecewise H^1 functions*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **41** (2003), no. 1, 306–324.

[BS08] S. C. Brenner and R. Scott, *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*, Springer Texts in Applied Mathematics 15, 2008.

[CFPP14] C. Carstensen, M. Feischl, M. Page, and D. Praetorius, *Axioms of adaptivity*, Comput. Math. Appl. **67** (2014), no. 6, 1195–1253.

[CGS] C. Carstensen, D. Gallistl, and M. Schedensack, *Adaptive nonconforming Crouzeix-Raviart FEM for eigenvalue problems*, (accepted for publication in Math. Comp.).

[CGS13] ———, *Discrete reliability for Crouzeix–Raviart FEMs*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **51** (2013), no. 5, 2935–2955.

[CG14] C. Carstensen and J. Gedicke, *Guaranteed lower bounds for eigenvalues*, Math. Comp. **83** (2014), no. 290, 2605–2629.

[CH06] C. Carstensen and R. H. W. Hoppe, *Convergence analysis of an adaptive nonconforming finite element method.*, Numer. Math. **103** (2006), no. 2, 251–266.

[CHX] L. Chen, M. J. Holst, and Jinchao Xu, *Convergence and optimality of adaptive mixed finite element methods*, Math. Comp. **78** (2009), no. 265, 35–53.

[CKNS08] J. M. Cascón, C. Kreuzer, R. H. Nochetto, and K. G. Siebert, *Quasi-optimal convergence rate for an adaptive finite element method*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **46** (2008), no. 5, 2524–2550.

[CPR13] C. Carstensen, D. Peterseim, and H. Rabus, *Optimal adaptive nonconforming FEM for the Stokes problem*, Numer. Math. **123** (2013), no. 2, 291–308.

[CR73] M. Crouzeix and P.-A. Raviart, *Conforming and nonconforming finite element methods for solving the stationary Stokes equations. I*, Rev. Française Automat. Informat. Recherche Opérationnelle Sér. Rouge **7** (1973), no. R-3, 33–75.

[DDP95] E. Dari, R. Durán, and C. Padra, *Error estimators for nonconforming finite element approximations of the Stokes problem*, Math. Comp. **64** (1995), no. 211, 1017–1033.

[DKS15] L. Diening, C. Kreuzer, and R. Stevenson, *Instance optimality of the adaptive maximum strategy*, Found. Comput. Math. (2015), online first.

[Dör96] W. Dörfler, *A convergent adaptive algorithm for Poisson's equation*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **33** (1996), 1106–1124.

[FFP] M. Feischl, T. Führer, and D. Praetorius, *Adaptive FEM with optimal convergence rates for a certain class of non-symmetric and possibly non-linear problems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **52** (2014), 601–625.

[GR86] V. Girault and P.-A. Raviart, *Finite element methods for Navier-Stokes equations. Theory and algorithms*, Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, 5, 1986.

[Gud10] T. Gudi, *A new error analysis for discontinuous finite element methods for linear elliptic problems*, Math. Comp. **79** (2010), no. 272, 2169–2189.

[HX13] J. Hu and J. Xu, *Convergence and optimality of the adaptive nonconforming linear element method for the Stokes problem*, J. Sci. Comput. **55** (2013), no. 1, 125–148.

[Kos94] I. Kossaczký, *A recursive approach to local mesh refinement in two and three dimensions*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **55** (1994), 275–288.

[KPP13] M. Karkulik, D. Pavlicek, and D. Praetorius, *On 2D newest vertex bisection: optimality of mesh-closure and H^1-stability of L_2-projection*, Constr. Approx. **38** (2013), no. 2, 213–234.

[KS11] C. Kreuzer and K. G. Siebert, *Decay rates of adaptive finite elements with Dörfler marking*, Numer. Math. **117** (2011), no. 4, 679–716.

[Mau95] J. M. Maubach, *Local bisection refinement for n-simplicial grids generated by reflection*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. **16** (1995), 210–227.

[Mit89] W. F. Mitchell, *A comparison of adaptive refinement techniques for elliptic problems*, ACM Trans. Math. Softw. **15** (1989), 326–347.

[MN05] K. Mekchay and R. H. Nochetto, *Convergence of adaptive finite element methods for general second order linear elliptic PDEs*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **43** (2005), no. 5, 1803–1827.

[MNS00] P. Morin, R. H. Nochetto, and K. G. Siebert, *Data oscillation and convergence of adaptive FEM*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **38** (2000), 466–488.

[MNS02] ———, *Convergence of adaptive finite element methods*, SIAM Review **44** (2002), 631–658.

[MNS03] ———, *Local problems on stars: A posteriori error estimators, convergence, and performance*, Math. Comp. **72** (2003), 1067–1097.

[MSV08] P. Morin, K. G. Siebert, and A. Veeser, *A basic convergence result for conforming adaptive finite elements*, Math. Models Methods Appl. **18** (2008), no. 5, 707–737.

[NSV09] R. H. Nochetto, K. G. Siebert, and A. Veeser, *Theory of adaptive finite element methods: An introduction*, Multiscale, Nonlinear and Adaptive Approximation (Ronald A. DeVore and Angela Kunoth, eds.), Springer, 2009, pp. 409–542.

[Rab10] H. Rabus, *A natural adaptive nonconforming FEM of quasi-optimal complexity*, Comput. Methods Appl. Math. **10** (2010), no. 3, 315–325.

[SS05] A. Schmidt and K. G. Siebert, *Design of adaptive finite element software. The finite element toolbox ALBERTA*, Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering 42. Springer, 2005.

[Sie11] K. G. Siebert, *A convergence proof for adaptive finite elements without lower bound*, IMA J. Numer. Anal. **31** (2011), no. 3, 947–970.

[Ste07] R. Stevenson, *Optimality of a standard adaptive finite element method*, Found. Comput. Math. **7** (2007), no. 2, 245–269.

[Ste08] ———, *The completion of locally refined simplicial partitions created by bisection*, Math. Comput. **77** (2008), no. 261, 227–241.

[Tra97] C. T. Traxler, *An algorithm for adaptive mesh refinement in n dimensions*, Computing **59** (1997), 115–137.

[Ver96] R. Verfürth, *A review of a posteriori error estimation and adaptive mesh-refinement techniques*, Adv. Numer. Math., John Wiley, Chichester, UK, 1996.

[Ver13] ———, *A posteriori error estimation techniques for finite element methods*, Numerical Mathematics and Scientific Computation, The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, 2013.

Appendix A. A Modified Transfer Operator

This appendix is concerned with the construction of the operator $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star} : \mathrm{CR}_0^1(\mathcal{T}) \to \mathrm{CR}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_\star)$, $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}_\star \in \widehat{\mathbb{T}}$ with $\mathcal{T} \leq \mathcal{T}_\star$, and the proof of Theorem 3.1. We recall that $\widehat{\mathcal{T}} := \mathsf{REFINE}(\mathcal{T}; \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}))$ is the smallest admissible refinement of $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}) \cap \mathcal{S}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}) = \emptyset$, i.e. all sides of $\mathcal{T}$ are bisected in $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$. Consequently, $\widehat{\mathcal{T}} \wedge \mathcal{T}_\star$ is the smallest admissible refinement of

$\mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathcal{S}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}})\cap(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})\setminus\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star))=\emptyset$. This triangulation is the intermediate triangulation from [CGS13].

Proposition A.1 (intermediate triangulation)**.** *Let $T\in\mathcal{T}$ and $\hat{T}\in\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star$ with $\hat{T}\subset T$, then $h_{\hat{T}}\le h_T\le 4h_{\hat{T}}$. Moreover, we have $\mathcal{T}\cap\mathcal{T}_\star=\mathcal{T}\cap(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star)$, $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})\cap\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)=\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})\cap\mathcal{S}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star)$, and $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})\setminus\mathcal{S}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star)=\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})\setminus\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)$.*

For $z\in\mathcal{N}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star)$, we call $(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star)(z):=\{T\in\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star : z\in T\}$ the star of z in $(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star)$. Let $T\in(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star)(z)$, then we define the set of refined edge connected simplices in $(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star)(z)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Z}(z;T):=\{T'\in\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star : \exists T=T_1,\dots,T_J=T'\in(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star)(z), J\in\mathbb{N},\\ \text{such that } T_j\cap T_{j+1}\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)\setminus\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}), j=1,\dots,J-1\}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that, apart from a refined analysis, the definition of $\mathcal{Z}(z;T)$ is the main difference in the construction of the transfer operator compared to [CGS13].

We define an auxiliary operator $J_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}:\mathrm{CR}_0^1(\mathcal{T})\to\{v\in L^2(\Omega) : v|_T\in P_1(T)\text{ for all }T\in\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star\}$ by averaging over the elements in $\mathcal{Z}(z;T)$. In particular, for $z\in\mathcal{N}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star)$ and $T\in(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star)(z)$ we set

$$J_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}v_{\mathcal{T}}|_T(z):=\begin{cases}\frac{1}{\#\mathcal{Z}(z;T)}\sum_{T'\in\mathcal{Z}(z;T)}v_{\mathcal{T}}|_{T'}(z), & \text{if } z\in\Omega\\ 0, & \text{if } z\in\partial\Omega.\end{cases}$$

Lemma A.2. *We have that $J_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}u_{\mathcal{T}}$ is continuous on $\Omega\setminus\bigcup\{S\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)\cap\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})\}$.*

Proof. Let $T,T'\in(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star)$ with $T\cap T'\notin\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)\cap\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$, then $\mathcal{Z}(z;T)=\mathcal{Z}(z;T')$ for $z\in\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{T})\cap T\cap T'$, and therefore $J_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}u_{\mathcal{T}}|_T(z)=J_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}u_{\mathcal{T}}|_{T'}(z)$. □

The transfer operator then defines a function $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}v_{\mathcal{T}}\in\mathrm{CR}_0^1(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\cap\mathcal{T}_\star)$ by

$$(\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}v_{\mathcal{T}})(\mathsf{mid}(S))=\begin{cases}v_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathsf{mid}(S)) & \text{if } S\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)\cap\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}),\\ (J_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}v_{\mathcal{T}})(\mathsf{mid}(S)) & \text{if } S\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)\setminus\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}).\end{cases}\tag{A.1}$$

Theorem A.3. *We have that $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}v_{\mathcal{T}}|_T=v_{\mathcal{T}}|_T$ for all $T\in\mathcal{T}\cap\mathcal{T}_\star$ and $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}v_{\mathcal{T}}\in\mathrm{CR}_0^1(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star)\cap\mathrm{CR}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_\star)$.*

Proof. Proposition A.1 and the definition of $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}$ imply $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}v_{\mathcal{T}}|_T=v_{\mathcal{T}}|_T$ for all $T\in\mathcal{T}\cap\mathcal{T}_\star$. Thanks to (A.1) we have $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}v_{\mathcal{T}}\in\mathrm{CR}_0^1(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star)$.

Let $S\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)\setminus\mathcal{S}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star)$ and $S\subset\partial T$ for some $T\in\mathcal{T}_\star$. Newest vertex bisection yields for $T\subset K\in\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star$, that $\{S'\in\mathcal{S}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}}\wedge\mathcal{T}_\star) : S'\subset\partial K\}\cap\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})=\emptyset$. Therefore, by (A.1), we have $(\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}v_{\mathcal{T}})|_T=(J_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}v_{\mathcal{T}})|_T$. We can argue analogously for the other triangle adjacent to S. Thus, thanks to Lemma A.2 we have that $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}v_{\mathcal{T}}$ is continuous along S. This proves $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}v_{\mathcal{T}}\in\mathrm{CR}_0^1(\mathcal{T}_\star)$. □

We are now in the position to prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $T \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}_\star$ and $\hat{T} \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}} \wedge \mathcal{T}_\star$ with $\hat{T} \subset T$ and let $\hat{S}$ be a side of $\hat{T}$. We denote by $\psi_{\hat{S}} \in \mathrm{CR}_0^1(\widehat{\mathcal{T}} \wedge \mathcal{T}_\star)$ the Crouzeix-Raviart basis function defined by $\psi_{\hat{S}}(\mathsf{mid}(\hat{S})) = 1$ and $\psi_{\hat{S}}(\mathsf{mid}(S)) = 0$ for $S \in \mathcal{S}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}} \wedge \mathcal{T}_\star) \setminus \{\hat{S}\}$. Then the affine function $(u_\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{J}_\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{T}_\star} u_\mathcal{T})|_{\hat{T}}$ reads as

$$\begin{aligned}(u_\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{J}_\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{T}_\star} u_\mathcal{T})|_{\hat{T}} \\ &= \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star) \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}),\, \hat{S} \subset \hat{T}} \big(u_\mathcal{T}|_{\hat{T}}(\mathsf{mid}(\hat{S})) - (J_\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{T}_\star} u_\mathcal{T})|_{\hat{T}}(\mathsf{mid}(\hat{S}))\big)\psi_{\hat{S}}.\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the triangle inequality and $\|h_\mathcal{T}^{-1}\psi_{\hat{S}}\|_{\hat{T}} \eqsim \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}\psi_{\hat{S}}\|_{\hat{T}} \eqsim 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|h_\mathcal{T}^{-1}(u_\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{J}_\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{T}_\star} u_\mathcal{T})\|_{\hat{T}} + \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(u_\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{J}_\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{T}_\star} u_\mathcal{T})\|_{\hat{T}} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\hat{S} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star) \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}),\, \hat{S} \subset \hat{T}} |u_\mathcal{T}|_{\hat{T}}(\mathsf{mid}(\hat{S})) - (J_\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{T}_\star} u_\mathcal{T})|_{\hat{T}}(\mathsf{mid}(\hat{S}))|.\end{aligned}$$

We recall from Lemma A.2, that $(u_\mathcal{T} - J_\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{T}_\star} u_\mathcal{T})|_{\hat{S}} \in P_1(\hat{S})$ is affine on $\hat{S}$, $\hat{S} = \mathrm{conv}\{y_1, y_2\} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star) \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$, and thus we have from the definition of $J_\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{T}_\star}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}|u_\mathcal{T}|_{\hat{T}}(\mathsf{mid}(\hat{S})) - (J_\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{T}_\star} u_\mathcal{T})|_{\hat{T}}(\mathsf{mid}(\hat{S}))| \\ &\le \sum_{k=1}^{2} \frac{|\sum_{T' \in \mathcal{Z}(y_k;\hat{T})}(u_\mathcal{T}|_{\hat{T}}(y_k) - u_\mathcal{T}|_{T'}(y_k))|}{2\,\#\mathcal{Z}(y_k;\hat{T})}.\end{aligned}$$

Fix $k \in \{1,2\}$, $T' \in \mathcal{Z}(y_k;\hat{T})$, and let $T_1, \dots, T_J \in \mathcal{Z}(y_k;\widehat{\mathcal{T}})$, with $J \in \mathbb{N}$, $\hat{T} = T_1$, $T_J = T'$, and $T_j \cap T_{j+1} \in \mathcal{S}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}} \wedge \mathcal{T}_\star) \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$ for $j = 1, \dots, J-1$. Then by a telescopic sum argument, we have

$$u_\mathcal{T}|_{\hat{T}}(y_k) - u_\mathcal{T}|_{T'}(y_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{J-1}(u_\mathcal{T}|_{T_j}(y_k) - u_\mathcal{T}|_{T_{j+1}}(y_k)).$$

Let $S = T_j \cap T_{j+1} \in \mathcal{S}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}} \wedge \mathcal{T}_\star) \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, J-1\}$. Since $[\![u_\mathcal{T}]\!]|_S$ is affine, Hölder's inequality yields

$$|[\![u_\mathcal{T}]\!]|_S(y_k)|^2 = 4h_S^{-2}\Big(\fint_S |[\![u_\mathcal{T}]\!]|\,\mathrm{d}x\Big)^2 \le 4h_S^{-1}\|[\![u_\mathcal{T}]\!]\|_S^2.$$

The shape regularity of $\mathbb{T}$ implies $\#\mathcal{Z}(y_k;\hat{T}) \eqsim 1$. Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})(z) := \{S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}) : z \in S\}$ denote the edges of $\mathcal{T}$ which contain $z \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{T})$. Summing over $\hat{T} \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}} \wedge \mathcal{T}_\star$ with $\hat{T} \subset T$ and a Poincaré inequality along $S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})(z) \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)$ shows

$$\begin{aligned}\|h_\mathcal{T}^{-1}(v_\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{J}_\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{T}_\star} v_\mathcal{T})\|_T^2 + \|\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}}(v_\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{J}_\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{T}_\star} v_\mathcal{T})\|_T^2 \\ &\lesssim \sum_{z \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{T}) \cap T} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})(z) \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)} h_S\, \|[\![\nabla_{\mathtt{NC}} v_\mathcal{T} \cdot \boldsymbol{t}]\!]\|_S^2.\end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

Here we used that $h_S \eqsim h_{S'}$ for all $\mathcal{S}(\widehat{\mathcal{T}} \wedge \mathcal{T}_\star) \ni S \subset S' \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})$; see Proposition A.1. Summing over all $T \in \mathcal{T}$, and accounting for the finite overlap of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T})(z) \setminus \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{T}_\star)$, $z \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{T})$, proves the assertion. □

Christian Kreuzer, Fakultät für Mathematik, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Universitätsstrasse 150, D-44801 Bochum, Germany
URL: http://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/ffm/Lehrstuehle/Kreuzer/index.html
E-mail address: christian.kreuzer@rub.de

Mira Schedensack, Institut für Mathematik, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, D-10099 Berlin, Germany
E-mail address: schedens@math.hu-berlin.de